

## REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-15, 17-29 and 85 are still pending in the application.

The other claims are either cancelled or withdrawn.

The main independent claims are rejected based on a combination of Valentine in view of Lai et al. (US 2007/00066327).

The claims are amended to recite that the mobile electronic device features a storage device configured to store digital picture/video data; a processor configured to edit and change said stored digital picture/video data; and a component configured to obtain data provided from a sensor, said processor being configured to generate and/or process said digital picture/video data according to said obtained sensor data.

To the extent that the obviousness rejection might be applied to the claims as amended, it is respectfully traversed for the following reasons:

The claimed mobile electronic device, e.g. a mobile telephone phone (see claim 6) allows digital picture/video data to be edited and changed based on obtained sensor data. As recited in independent claim 1, as amended, the digital picture/video data may be recorded, displayed, created, copied, converted, modified, linked to events, attached and generated in response to the obtained sensor data, which may take the form of an incoming call, a time of day, a diary input, etc., as described in the patent application on page 7, line 35, through page 9, line 6. In operation, the mobile phone may provide, in response to an associated incoming call, a respective digital picture/video data image that was recorded and modified by the user specifically for that particular caller.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Valentine merely discloses a technique, particularly over wireless communication systems, for providing voice messaging services and options, including caller specific greetings and options based on time, activity or specific location that can be activated manually or by a schedule. See Valentine, paragraph [0009] through [0015]. In operation, Valentine's technique stores voice messaging content and processes the same based on sensor data, which may take the form of caller specific information, time of day, day of week, location, etc. Valentine also discloses using some component to obtain such sensor data from a sensor device, to provide the sensor data to a processor, which in turn provides the voice messaging services and options based on such sensor data.

However, it is respectfully submitted that Valentine does not teach or suggest to use this technique in a mobile electronic device, e.g. a mobile telephone (see claim 6) that allows digital picture/video data to be edited and changed based on obtained sensor data, or applying the same to solve problems related to, or associated with such mobile electronic devices, terminals or telephones. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Valentine also does not teach or suggest to apply this technique so as to allow a user to store, process (i.e. edit and change) and generate such **digital picture/video data** in response to the obtained sensor data, as claimed. Because of this, unlike the claimed invention Valentine's voice messaging services and options do not allow the mobile phone to provide, in response to an associated incoming call, a respective **digital picture/video data image** that was recorded and modified by the user specifically for that particular caller.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that that Lai et al. does not make up for this fundamental deficiency in the teaching of Valentine, because Lai et al. merely discloses a technique for dynamic service enablement of applications in heterogenous mobile environments, which relates to the distribution and usage of digital content over mobile devices implemented based on mobile digital rights management (DRM), as disclosed in paragraphs 6-10 and 84. The whole thrust of Lai et al.' technique is to restrict, and even prevent copying, alteration, distribution, etc. of digital content, which effectively teaches away from the editing and changing digital content such as digital picture/video data, as claimed. In addition, similar to Valentine, Lai et al. also does not teach or suggest to allow a user to store, process (i.e. edit and change) and generate digital picture/video data in response to the obtained sensor data, as claimed. Finally, it is respectfully submitted that Lai et al., including paragraphs 6-10 and 84, also does not teach or suggest either applying its mobile DRM technique to a system such as Valentine's, or applying its mobile DRM technique to solve problems related to, or associated with such mobile electronic devices, terminals or telephones. Because of this, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the cited prior art in the manner proposed.

Independent claims 19, 29 and 85 have similar limitations and are deemed patentable over the proposed combination for similar reasons.

For all these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination does not teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 1, 19, 29 and 85.

Remaining Dependent Claims

The remaining dependent claims depend directly or indirectly from one or more of the aforementioned independent claims, contain all the limitations thereof, and are deemed patentable for all the reasons set forth above.

Upon an indication of an allowable generic claim, it is respectfully submitted that all the withdrawn claims should be reintroduced.

Conclusion

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in order to submit this amendment to deposit account no. 23-0442.

For all these reasons, reconsideration and early allowance is respectfully requested.

8 July 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/William J. BARBER/

William J. Barber  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 32,720

WJB/dac  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, PO Box 224  
Monroe CT 06468  
(203) 261-1234